

## REMARKS

Applicants will address each of the Examiner's rejections in the order in which they appear in the Office Action.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

#### Claims 1, 9-14

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects Claims 1, 9-14 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Koyama (US 2001/0002703) in view of Himeshima et al. (JP 09-235546). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

While Applicants traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are amending independent Claim 1 to recite the feature of "wherein the wiring is in contact with the anode on the first passivation film." This feature is supported by, for example, Fig. 3 of the present application. For example, Fig. 3 shows both the wiring (unnumbered) and anode (121) formed over the first passivation film (125). Further, the wiring is directly in contact with the anode (121) on the first passivation film (125).

In contrast, in the Office Action, the Examiner contends that in Fig. 11 of Koyama, 43 is a wiring and 41 is a first passivation film. With regard to the anode, the Examiner cites paragraph [241] of Koyama which states that 47 is an anode. However, wiring 43 is not in contact with anode 41.

The Examiner also cites Figs. 16a-16c and paragraphs [321]-[324] in Koyama. However, in those paragraphs and figures, the wiring is not in contact with the anode on the first passivation layer.

Himeshima also does not disclose or suggest this claimed feature.

Therefore, the cited references do not disclose or suggest the device of independent Claim 1 and those claims dependent thereon of the present application, and these claims are patentable thereover. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### Claims 2, 9-14

The Examiner also rejects Claims 2, 9-14 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamagata (US 2002/0070385) in view of Koyama and Himeshima et al. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

While Applicants traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are amending independent Claim 2 in a similar manner to that discussed above for independent Claim 1.

As the Examiner admits, Yamagata does not appear to disclose many of the claimed features of Claim 2, including the first and second passivation films. Therefore, Yamagata does not disclose or suggest the claimed feature of “wherein the wiring is in contact with the anode on the first passivation film.” The Examiner also cites Koyama and Himeshima. However, as explained above, neither of these references disclose or suggest this claimed feature.

Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above, independent Claim 2 is also not disclosed or suggested by the cited references. Accordingly, independent Claim 2 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over these references, and it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

### Claim 3

The Examiner also rejects Claim 3 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamagata, Koyama and Himeshima et al. and further in view of Yamazaki et al. (US PubI 2002/0074936). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

This claim is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above for the independent claims, this claim is also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

### Claim 4

The Examiner also rejects Claim 4 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamagata, Koyama and Himeshima et al. and further in view of Yamazaki et al. (US 6,359,320). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

This claim is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above for the independent claims, this claim is also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

### Claim 5

The Examiner also rejects Claim 5 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamagata, Koyama and Himeshima et al. and further in view of Tamai et al. (US 5,793,497). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

This claim is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above for the independent claims, this claim is also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### Claim 6

The Examiner also rejects Claim 6 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Koyama and Himeshima et al. or Yamagata, Koyama and Himeshima et al. and further in view of *Producing Monolithic Light Emitting Diode Display Chips* (IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin Vol. 16, Issue 1, Pg. 6, 6/1/1973). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

This claim is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above for the independent claims, this claim is also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### Claim 7

The Examiner also rejects Claim 7 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Koyama and Himeshima et al. or Yamagata, Koyama and Himeshima et al. and further in view of Jones et al. (US 6,069,443). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

This claim is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above for the independent claims, this claim is also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### Claim 15

The Examiner also rejects Claim 15 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Koyama and Himeshima et al. or Yamagata, Koyama and Himeshima et al. and

further in view of Tamano et al. (US 5,968,675). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

This claim is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above for the independent claims, this claim is also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### New Claim

Applicants are also adding new Claim 23. It is respectfully submitted that this claim is also allowable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this new claim be entered and allowed.

If any fee should be due for this claim, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

#### Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any further fee should be due for this amendment, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 30, 2006

/Mark J. Murphy/  
Mark J. Murphy  
Registration No. 34,225

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,  
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, LTD.  
200 West Adams Street  
Suite 2850  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
(312) 236-8500

Customer no. 000026568